Document 3

Filed 07/27/17

Page 1 of 3

Case 3:16-cv-00548-RCJ-VPC

2 3

1

5

7

6

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

///

///

24

12(b)(6). Wilhelm v. Rotman, 680 F.3d 1113, 1121 (9th Cir. 2012). When a court dismisses a complaint upon screening, the plaintiff should be given leave to amend the complaint with directions as to curing its deficiencies, unless it is clear from the face of the complaint that the deficiencies could not be cured by amendment. Cato v. United States, 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995).

III. **ANALYSIS**

Parole board members "are entitled to absolute quasi-judicial immunity for decisions to grant, deny, or revoke parole because these tasks are functionally comparable to tasks performed by judges." Swift v. California, 384 F.3d 1184, 1189 (9th Cir. 2004) (internal quotation marks omitted). Also, § 1983 claims based on parole determinations are categorically barred by Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994) unless and until the determination is overturned via writ of habeas corpus. There is a narrow exception: if the only thing a plaintiff seeks is declaratory and injunctive relief granting him a hearing free from cognizable constitutional infirmity, and not a favorable decision, i.e., not any relief that will necessarily affect the length of his confinement, he may (indeed must) bring the claim under § 1983 as opposed to habeas corpus. See Wilkinson v. Dotson, 544 U.S. 74, 82 (2005).

Plaintiff prays for, inter alia, "immediate release - continue on parole." The Complaint is therefore barred by Heck. Even if it were not, the due process claim would fail, and amendment would be futile, because there is no cognizable liberty interest in parole in Nevada, so no process is constitutionally due. Moor v. Palmer, 603 F.3d 658, 662 (9th Cir. 2010) (citing Severance v. Armstrong, 620 P.2d 369, 370 (Nev. 1980)). As for the First Amendment retaliation claim, Plaintiff has not identified any protected speech against which Defendants allegedly retaliated.

2 of 3

IV. AMENDMENT

Plaintiff may amend the First Amendment retaliation claim. Plaintiff is informed that the amended complaint must be complete in itself, because it supersedes the original complaint. See Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). If Plaintiff does not file an amended complaint within twenty-eight (28) days, the Court will dismiss without further notice. The Court defers a decision on the motion to proceed in forma pauperis at this time.

CONCLUSION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk shall DETACH and FILE the Complaint (ECF No. 1-1).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Count I is DISMISSED without leave to amend, and Count II is DISMISSED with leave to amend.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall mail Plaintiff a civil rights complaint form and instructions.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall have twenty-eight (28) days to file an amended complaint. If Plaintiff does not file an amended complaint, the Court will dismiss without further notice. Plaintiff shall clearly title the amended complaint as such by writing the words "FIRST AMENDED" above the words "CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT" on the first page.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 27th day of July, 2017.

ROBERT C. JONES
United States District Judge